

d-OBJECTS KINEMATICS ON SMOOTH MANIFOLDS

Sergey S.Kokarev*

Department of theoretical physics, r.409, YSPU, Respublikanskaya 108,
Yaroslavl, 150000, Russia

Abstract

The kinematical part of general theory of deformational structures on smooth manifolds is developed. We introduce general concept of d-objects deformation, then within the set of all such deformations we develop some special algebra and investigate group and homotopical properties of the set. In case of proper deformations some propositions, generalizing isometry theory on Riemannian manifolds are formulated.

1 Introduction

Recent time the strong tendency towards the inclusion of an embedded objects into the scope of theoretical and mathematical physics is observed (see references in [1]). One should refer to the subject all string and p -brane models [2, 3], including their supersymmetric and noncommutative generalizations [4], embedding methods of GR and its alternative formulations and generalizations [5], geometrical methods of nonlinear differential equations theory and jets approach [6] and many other things. Probably, this central position of the "embedded objects" in modern physics can't be accidental: it may reflect either multidimensional nature of physical reality, observed through all its levels, or some "immanent" to us, as observers, ways of its descriptions.

On lagrangian level, within variety of our field theoretical models, exploiting embedded objects, there easily can be seen its amazing and, in our opinion, deep interrelation with elasticity theory of continuous media [7], may be with general properties such as nonlinearity, plasticity, viscosity, anisotropy, and may be possessing internal spin, nematic or smectic structures or memory [8, 9, 10, 11]. Particularly, in the papers [12, 13, 14, 15] it has been shown, that Einstein GR and standard classical solid dynamics admit natural formulation in terms of mechanical straining of thin 4D plates and 4D strings (strongly

tensed bars) correspondingly.

The interesting and very important problem, arising now, is to extract and formulate general ideas of continuous media physics in its the most abstract and general form, independent on peculiarities of one or another theory, both to be able to see and use it within general context of our field theoretical models and to apply it successfully in some concrete situations. So, we intend to follow the line of investigations, that will be called here *general theory of deformational structures*, the aim of which — to formulate and work out universal language for the objects, that are able, in some sense, to be "deformed".

In the present short paper we give the sketch of the approach, and directly generalize standard elasticity theory for bodies in $\mathbb{E}^3$ for the case of arbitrary smooth manifold and smooth forms as deformational metrics (below d -manifold, d -objects and d -metrics). We take here for consideration only *kinematics*, which is totally described by the *free deformational structure*. Dynamical deformational structure consist of free one and variational procedure, which we'll not consider in the paper. By the volume restrictions, all statements are only formulated (without proofs). Anywhere, if it is possible, we use standard notations of smooth manifold theory, as, for example, in [16].

2 Definitions

We call *free deformational structure* $\mathfrak{D}_0$ the collection $\langle \mathcal{B}, \mathcal{M}, \mathcal{E}, \Theta \rangle$, where:

$\mathcal{B}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ — smooth, connected, closed manifolds, $\dim \mathcal{B} = d$, $\dim \mathcal{M} = n \geq d$;

$\mathcal{E}$ — set of all possible smooth embeddings $\mathcal{B} \hookrightarrow \mathcal{M}$;

$\Theta \in \Omega^{\otimes p}(\mathcal{M})$ — some smooth real form of rank p on $\mathcal{M}$. In what follows we shall use the abbreviations: $\mathcal{B}$ — *d-body*, $\mathcal{M}$ — *d-manifold*, Θ — *d-metrics*, and image

$$\iota(\mathcal{B}) \equiv \mathcal{S} \subset \mathcal{M} \quad (1)$$

for some $\iota \in \mathcal{E}$ — *d-objects* or *deformant*.

Embedding ι induces form $(d\iota)^*\Theta$ on $T^*\mathcal{B}^{\otimes p}$, where $(d\iota)^*$ — embedding ι codifferential, acting in tensor product $T^*\mathcal{S}^{\otimes p}$. Let consider some another embedding $\iota' \in \mathcal{E}$, which induces its own *d-object* $\iota'(\mathcal{B}) \equiv \mathcal{S}' \subset \mathcal{M}$. In $T^*\mathcal{B}^{\otimes p}$ we'll have form $(d\iota')^*\Theta$. Easily to see, that composition

$$\iota' \circ \iota^{-1} \equiv \zeta \quad (2)$$

is diffeomorphism $\mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}' = \zeta(\mathcal{S})$, which we'll call *deformation* of *d-object* in $\mathcal{M}$.

The deformation ζ has natural local measure — difference of two forms, taken in the same point of $b \in \mathcal{B}$:

$$(d\iota')^*\Theta_{\iota'(b)} - (d\iota)^*\Theta_{\iota(b)} \equiv \Delta_{\mathcal{B}}(b), \quad (3)$$

where we have introduced notation $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}$ for *deformation form* on $\mathcal{B}$. Using definition (2) of deformation and well known property of codifferential: $d(\alpha \circ \beta)^* = (d\beta)^* \circ (d\alpha)^*$ one can obtain the equivalent representation:

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}} = (d\iota)^*((d\zeta)^*\Theta - \Theta), \quad (4)$$

and define deformation form

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{S}} \equiv ((d\iota)^*)^{-1}\Delta_{\mathcal{B}} = (d\zeta)^*\Theta - \Theta \quad (5)$$

on deformant $\mathcal{S}$. Lets note, that representations (4) and (5) correspond to material and referent descriptions of deformable bodies configurations in classical dynamics [17]. All is illustrated on diagrams (6).

$$\begin{array}{ccc} \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\iota'} & \mathcal{S}' \subseteq \mathcal{M} & T^*\mathcal{B}^{\otimes p} & \xleftarrow{(d\iota')^*} & T^*\mathcal{S}'^{\otimes p} \\ \parallel & \zeta = \iota' \circ \iota^{-1} \uparrow & & \parallel & (d\zeta)^* \downarrow & \\ \mathcal{B} & \xrightarrow{\iota} & \mathcal{S} \subseteq \mathcal{M} & T^*\mathcal{B}^{\otimes p} & \xleftarrow{(d\iota)^*} & T^*\mathcal{S}^{\otimes p} \end{array} \quad (6)$$

3 Pseudogroup of deformations of *d-body* in $\mathcal{M}$.

As it follows from definition (2), the set of all deformations of *d-objects* in $\mathcal{M}$, which we'll denote $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$, can be treated as image of the surjective map $\phi : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$, acting by the rule:

$$\phi(\iota_\alpha, \iota_\beta) = \iota_\beta \circ \iota_\alpha^{-1} \equiv \zeta_{\alpha\beta}. \quad (7)$$

The following proposition clears the relation between $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ and $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$.

Proposition 1 *Fibre $\phi^{-1}(\zeta) = \{d \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \mid d = (\iota_\zeta \circ l, \zeta \circ \iota_\zeta \circ l)\}$, where l runs all elements from the set $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{B})$ — group of diffeomorphisms of $\mathcal{B}$, ζ — some element of $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$, and embedding ι_ζ satisfies the condition: $\text{Im}(\iota_\zeta) = \text{Dom}(\zeta)$.*

Note, that the set $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{B})$ can be viewed as subgroup of $\text{Aut}(\mathcal{E})$, since $\mathcal{E} \circ \text{Diff}(\mathcal{B}) = \mathcal{E}$. Now we claim, that $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$ is factor-set $\pi_D(\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}) \equiv \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$, consisting of classes of elements $[(\iota_\alpha, \iota_\beta)]_D \equiv d_{\alpha\beta}$, that lie in the same fibre, where the element $(\iota_\alpha, \iota_\beta) \in \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ does. Here π_D — factorization map by equivalence $\sim^D$, given by division $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$ by fibres $\phi^{-1}(\zeta)$.

Since $\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ is not direct product, then projections pr_1, pr_2 don't defined on $\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ in common sense. Let $\text{Emb}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$ be the set of all images $\{\text{Im}(\iota)\}_{\iota \in \mathcal{E}}$. In what follows we'll use projections as mappings $\text{pr}_i : \mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E} \rightarrow \text{Emb}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$ $i = 1, 2$, which acts on every class $[(\iota_1, \iota_2)]_D$ by the rule:

$$\text{pr}_1[(\iota_1, \iota_2)]_D \equiv \iota_1(\mathcal{B}); \quad \text{pr}_2[(\iota_1, \iota_2)]_D \equiv \iota_2(\mathcal{B}). \quad (8)$$

The formal notation $\text{pr}_i(d)$ will be understood below exactly in this sense.

On the set $\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ one can introduce binary relation:

$$\rho = \{(d_1, d_2) \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \times \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \mid \text{pr}_1(d_1) = \text{pr}_2(d_2)\}, \quad (9)$$

It is easily to check, that ρ is T-reflective and T-antisymmetric, i.e.:

$$(d, d^T) \in \rho,$$

and, if simultaneously

$$(d_1, d_2) \in \rho \quad (d_2, d_1) \in \rho, \quad \text{then } d_2 = d_1^T.$$

Here $(d^T)_{\alpha\beta} \equiv d_{\beta\alpha}$. We'll call this relation T-tournament¹.

¹Tournament is reflective and antisymmetric binary relation.

Let $d \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$. Let denote as $Y_d^\mp$ the following subsets:

$$Y_d^- \equiv \{d' \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \mid (d, d') \in \rho\};$$

$$Y_d^+ \equiv \{d' \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} \mid (d', d) \in \rho\},$$

which will be referred to as the *bottom* and *top* sets of the element d respectively.

Proposition 2 *On the set $\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ with T-tournament ρ one can define pseudogroup structures².*

It is easily to check in our case, that pseudogroup operation can be defined as follows. For any $d \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ and for all $d' \in Y_d^-$ $d'' \in Y_d^+$ we define multiplication "*" from the right and from the left by the rules:

$$d * d' \equiv d \circ d'; \quad d'' * d \equiv d'' \circ d.$$

In components:

$$d * d' = [(\iota_1, \iota_2)]_D * [(\iota', \iota_1)]_D \equiv [(\iota', \iota_2)]_D;$$

$$d'' * d = [(\iota_2, \iota'')]_D * [(\iota_1, \iota_2)]_D \equiv [(\iota_1, \iota'')]_D.$$

Unit elements will be given by the expressions:

$$e_d^- \equiv [(\text{pr}_1(d), \text{pr}_1(d))]_D \in \Delta(\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}),$$

$$e_d^+ \equiv [(\text{pr}_2(d), \text{pr}_2(d))]_D \in \Delta(\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}),$$

where $\Delta(\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}})$ — diagonal of $\widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ (in the sense (8)). Also, for every $d \in \widehat{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}}$ there exist unique unit element d^{-1} and it easily to check in components, that $d^{-1} = d^T$.

So, the set of deformations $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$ — pseudogroup.

4 Homotopies and special deformations

Lets consider $H_{\mathcal{E}}$, consisting of homotopic classes of embeddings $\mathcal{E}$. We define here *strong smooth homotopy* of embedding $\iota \in \mathcal{E}$ as smooth mapping $F : \mathcal{B} \times I \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, where $I = [0, 1]$, such, that

²Let remind, that pseudogroup is a set of elements $\mathcal{A}$, where group multiplication $*$ is defined may be on some subset (binary relation) $\mathcal{U} \subset \mathcal{A} \times \mathcal{A}$ and where hold the following properties: associativity, for every $a \in \mathcal{A}$ there exist unique right e_a^- and left e_a^+ units elements (generally speaking depending on a), lied in $\mathcal{A}$ and there exists unique inverse element a^{-1} , lying in $\mathcal{A}$, such that $a * e_a^- = e_a^+ * a = a$ and $a * a^{-1} = e_a^+$, $a^{-1} * a = e_a^-$.

$F(\mathcal{B}, 0) = \iota$ and $F(\mathcal{B}, s) \equiv F_s(\mathcal{B}) \in \mathcal{E}$ for every $s \in I$. Two embeddings ι and ι' are said to be homotopic: $\iota \stackrel{H}{\sim} \iota'$, if there exist strong homotopy F , such that $F_0(\mathcal{B}) = \iota$, $F_1(\mathcal{B}) = \iota'$. Homotopy relation is equivalence on $\mathcal{E}$ and $H_{\mathcal{E}} \equiv \mathcal{E} / \stackrel{H}{\sim} \equiv \pi_H(\mathcal{E})$.

Lets define strong homotopic equivalence on $\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}$. We'll say, that $(\iota_1, \iota_2) \stackrel{H}{\sim} (\iota'_1, \iota'_2)$, if simultaneously $\iota_1 \stackrel{H}{\sim} \iota'_1$ $\iota_2 \stackrel{H}{\sim} \iota'_2$. Evidently, the set of classes of the strong homotopic equivalence $H_{\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E}} = \pi_H(\mathcal{E} \times \mathcal{E})$ coincides with $H_{\mathcal{E}} \times H_{\mathcal{E}} = \pi_H(\mathcal{E}) \times \pi_H(\mathcal{E})$.

Now we are able to define some special kinds of deformations in $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$. Lets consider the set $\pi_H^{-1}(\Delta(H_{\mathcal{E}} \times H_{\mathcal{E}}))$, i.e. the set of pair of embeddings, that are homotopic to each other. The set, after factorization by π_D induces the subset $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})_0 \subseteq \text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$, which we'll call *proper deformation*. Within the classical (nonquantum) theory of deformational structures we'll be concerning only with this type of deformations. Evidently, $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})_0$ — subpseudogroup of $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})$.

Lets consider the set of pair from $\pi_D \circ \pi_H^{-1}(\Delta(H_{\mathcal{E}} \times H_{\mathcal{E}}))$ of the kind $d(\iota) = [(\iota, \iota \circ l_0)]_D$, where $\iota \in \mathcal{E}$, $l_0 \in [\text{id}_{\mathcal{B}}]_H$. Evidently, that the set $\{d(\iota)\}$ is no more, less then smooth proper diffeomorphisms $\text{Diff}(\mathcal{S})_0$ of the deformant. We'll call it *proper sliding* of the deformant $\mathcal{S} = \iota(\mathcal{B})$ in $\mathcal{M}$ and denote Sl_{ι} . Evidently, Sl_{ι} is subpseudogroup of $\text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})_0$, isomorphic to the group $\pi_H^{-1}[\text{id}_{\mathcal{B}}]$.

5 Vector fields, rigid motions, generalized Killing equations and d -coverings of d -manifolds.

Lets consider some proper deformation $\zeta_0 = [(\iota, \iota')]_D \in \text{DEF}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{B})_0 : \mathcal{S} = \iota(\mathcal{B}) \rightarrow \mathcal{S}' = \iota'(\mathcal{B})$. Let F_t — some homotopy, connecting ι and ι' . Consider the set $\mathcal{M} \supset \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}'} = \cup_{t \in I} F_t(\mathcal{B}) \equiv \cup_{t \in I} \mathcal{S}_t$. It can be treated as smooth mapping of the smooth manifold $I \times \mathcal{B} \rightarrow \mathcal{M}$, which, generally speaking, is not submanifold and even is not immersion in $\mathcal{M}$. Its boundary $\partial \mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}'}$ is $\mathcal{S} \cup \mathcal{S}' \cup_{t \in I} F_t(\partial \mathcal{B})$. Let d/dt — uniquely determined horizontal vector field on $\mathcal{B} \times I$, i.e. such that $d\pi_1(d/dt) = 0$, $d\pi_2(d/dt) = d/dt$, where π_1, π_2 — projections of $\mathcal{B} \times I$ to $\mathcal{B}$ and I correspondingly. The set $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}'}$ is composed of an integral lines $\{F_t(b)\}_{b \in \mathcal{B}}$ of the vector field $v = dF(d/dt)$, defined on $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}\mathcal{S}'}$. The family of embeddings $\{F_t(\mathcal{B})\}_{t \in I}$ induces the family of deformation

forms $\{\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}^t\}_{t \in I}$ by the following rule:

$$\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}^t = (dF_t)^* \Theta - (dF_0)^* \Theta.$$

We'll say, that the homotopy F_t is *rigid motion* of the d -body $\mathcal{B}$ in $\mathcal{M}$ from the configuration $S = F_0(\mathcal{B})$ to the configuration $S' = F_1(\mathcal{B})$, if $\Delta_{\mathcal{B}}^t = 0$ for any $t \in I$ or, in other words the image $(dF_t)^* \Theta|_{S_t}$ is constant on I .

Proposition 3 *Homotopy F_t from S to S' is rigid motion if and only if*

$$L_v \Theta|_{\mathcal{P}} = 0, \quad (10)$$

where L_v — Lie derivative along the vector field $v = d_t F_t(\mathcal{B}, d/dt)$ on $\mathcal{P}_{SS'}$.

The equations of the type (10) we'll call *generalized Killing equations*.

Let $S = \iota(\mathcal{B})$ will be some fixed deformant and let $\text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(S)$ — set of its all possible rigid motions in $\mathcal{M}$. The set is, generally speaking, proper subset of path connected component of the embedding ι in $\mathcal{E}$ (the component is exactly the class $[\iota]_H$ of homotopic to ι embeddings), which is defined by the specification of a d -metrics. Easily to see, that rigid motions define equivalency $\overset{M}{\sim}$ on $\mathcal{E}$: we'll call the two embeddings ι, ι' — equivalent: $\iota \overset{M}{\sim} \iota'$, if there exist homotopy $F \in \text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(\iota(\mathcal{B}))$, connecting ι and ι' . Obviously, the equivalency $\overset{M}{\sim}$ is more weak then $\overset{H}{\sim}$, then the class $[\iota]_H = \cup_{\alpha} [\iota_{\alpha}]_M$, where $\{\iota_{\alpha}\}$ — some set of all pairwise $\overset{M}{\sim}$ -nonequivalent elements from $[\iota]_H$, and $[\iota_{\alpha}]_M \cap [\iota_{\beta}]_M = \emptyset$ for all $\alpha \neq \beta$. We'll call $[\iota_{\alpha}]_M$ — α -component $[\iota]_H$, and its image

$$\mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}} \equiv \bigcup_{F \in \text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(S_{\alpha})} \mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}F(\mathcal{B})}$$

rigidity α -component of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ relatively to embedding ι . The family $\{\mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}}\}$ gives some covering of $\mathcal{M}$:

$$\mathcal{M} = \bigcup_{\alpha} \mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}},$$

which we'll call *deformational $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta, h)$ -covering of the manifold $\mathcal{M}$* , where $H_{\mathcal{E}} \ni h = \pi_H(\iota)$, or, more shortly, *d -covering*.

Within the theory of dynamical deformable structures, where physical action should be considered as functional of deformation form: $\mathcal{A} = \mathcal{A}[\Delta]$, it is

naturally to use as configuration space of deformant not $[\iota(\mathcal{B})]_H$, but its factor:

$$\{[\iota(\mathcal{B})]_H / \overset{M}{\sim}\} \equiv \pi_M([\iota(\mathcal{B})]_H) \simeq \{\mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}}\},$$

which reflects the deformational indistinguishability of those configurations, that are connected by a some rigid motion. We'll call the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ *deformationally discrete* relatively to its rigid $(\mathcal{B}, \Theta, h)$ -covering, if π_M — identical mapping, and *deformationally trivial*, if π_M — constant mapping. Then, the manifold $\mathcal{M}$ will be called *deformationally homogeneous (d -homogeneous)*, if

$$\mathcal{P}_{S_{\alpha}} = \mathcal{M} \quad (11)$$

for some α and *completely deformationally homogeneous*, if (11) is valid for all α .

Deformationally trivial manifolds, have no significance from the view point of deformational structure theory, by the following

Proposition 4 *Any deformationally trivial manifold has zero d -metrics.*

Riemannian manifold with general metrics g is an example of deformationally discrete manifold. The euclidian space $\mathbb{E}^n$ is completely deformationally homogeneous relatively $(\mathcal{B}, \eta, h)$ -decomposition, where η — euclidian metric, $\mathcal{B}$ — arbitrary d -body, h — arbitrary element $H_{\mathcal{E}}$. As an example of deformationally homogeneous but not completely deformationally homogeneous manifolds lets consider the following situation. Let $\mathcal{M} = \overline{D^2}_{2r}(0) \setminus D_r^2(0)$ — closed ring on 2D euclidian plane (as usually, $D_r^n(a)$ — n -dimensional disk with radius r and center a , bar above letter — closure), $\Theta = \eta$ — 2D euclidian metrics, $\mathcal{B} = S^1$, $\iota(S^1) = S_R^1 \subset \mathcal{M}$ — circle with radius R and $\pi_H(\iota) = 1$ (in the considered case $\pi_H(\mathcal{E}) \equiv \pi_1(\mathcal{M})$ — fundamental group of $\mathcal{M}$, isomorphic $\mathbb{Z}$.) Then, in case $R < 3r/2$, $\mathcal{P}_{S_R^1} = \overline{D^2}_{2R-r}(0) \setminus D_r^2(0) \neq \mathcal{M}$ and only in case $R = 3r/2$ we have $\mathcal{P}_{S_{3r/2}^1} = \mathcal{M}$.

In conclusion we formulate two propositions and give an example, all illustrating more general character of the deformational structure theory in comparison with isometry theory of Riemannian spaces.

Let $\text{Imm}(v) \equiv \{p \in \mathcal{M} \mid \phi_t(p) = p\}$ — is the set of all immobile points of the full one-parametric group ϕ_t , generated by some smooth vector field v .

Proposition 5 *If manifold $\mathcal{M}$ admits isometry of d -metrics, i.e. if there exists vector field $v \in T\mathcal{M}$, such that $L_v \Theta = 0$, then $\forall S$ such that $S \not\subseteq \text{Imm}(v)$,*

there exists nonidentical rigid motion $\{\phi_t|_{\mathcal{S}}\} \in \text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{S})$ and, by the fact, $\mathcal{M}$ is not deformationally discrete.

Proposition 6 *If manifold $\mathcal{M}$ admits r -parametric isometry group $\mathcal{G}$, generated by vector fields $\{v_1, \dots, v_r\}$, such that $L_{v_i}\Theta = 0$, $i = 1, \dots, r$, that act on $\mathcal{M}$*

- 1) *transitively, then $\mathcal{M}$ — completely deformationally homogeneous (relatively any decomposition) ;*
- 2) *intransitively, and if also $\mathcal{S} \cap \text{Orb } \mathcal{G}$ — connected for some orbit $\text{Orb } \mathcal{G} \subset \mathcal{M}$, then $\text{Orb } \mathcal{G}$ — completely deformationally homogeneous relatively its $(\iota^{-1}(\mathcal{S} \cap \text{Orb } \mathcal{G}), \Theta|_{\text{Orb } \mathcal{G}}, h = \pi_H(\iota))$ -decomposition. Here, as usually, $\mathcal{S} = \iota(\mathcal{B})$.*

Particularly, if $\mathcal{S} = \iota(\mathcal{B}) = \text{Orb } \mathcal{G}$, then $\text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{S}) \cap \text{Sl}_t \neq \emptyset$ defines the group of *rigid proper sliding*.

So, if Θ — Riemannian (or any other d -) metrics on $\mathcal{M}$ and $\mathcal{M}$ admits isometry, then nontrivial rigid motions of d -objects will be always exist. The following example shows, that inverse is not valid.

Let $\mathcal{M} = \mathbb{R}^2$ with cartesian coordinate system $\{x_1, x_2\}$, $\mathcal{B} = I = [0, 1] \in \mathbb{R}$, $\Lambda^1(\mathbb{R}^2) \ni \Theta = (x^1 x^2 + \coth x^2) dx^1$. Let $\iota(\mathcal{B}) \equiv \mathcal{S} = \{0 \leq x^1 \leq 1, x^2 = 0\}$. By the fact, that $\Theta|_{x^2=0} = dx^1 = \text{const}$, it is easily to see that the set of homotopies

$$\{F_t : \mathcal{S} \rightarrow \mathcal{S}_t = (x_1 + t, 0), 0 \leq x_1 \leq 1, -\infty < t < \infty\},$$

(they are simple rigid translations of units interval along axe x^1) lies in $\text{MOT}_{\mathcal{M}}(\mathcal{S})$. Moreover, $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}} = \mathbb{R}^1 = \{(x^1, 0)\}$. The related vector field $v(t, x^1)$, along which $L_{\Theta}|_{\mathcal{P}} = 0$ is simply $\partial/\partial x^1$. It is easily to show, that v doesn't admit smooth continuation $\tilde{v}$ from the $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}} \subset \mathbb{R}^2$ to $\mathbb{R}^2$. Really, Killing equations $L_{\tilde{v}}\Theta = 0$ for this case with account $\tilde{v}|_{\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}} = \partial/\partial x^1$ reads:

$$\tilde{v}^2 = -\frac{x^2}{x^1 + \sinh x^2}.$$

The component has singularity on line $x^1 = -\sinh x^2$, which cross any neighborhood of $\mathcal{P}_{\mathcal{S}}$ in $\mathbb{R}^2$.

Acknowledgements

I am very thankful to local organizers of the 5-th Asian-Pacific conference for comfortable work conditions and full financial supporting, and also to the professor of algebra chair of YSPU A.S.Tikhomirov for valuable consultations during the preparing of the paper.

References

- [1] M. Pavšič, V. Tapia, “Resource letter on geometrical results for embeddings and branes”. gr-qc/0010045.
- [2] M. Green, J. Schwarz, E. Witten, “Superstring theory”, Cambridge University Press, Cambridge, 1989.
- [3] C. P. Bachas, “Lectures on D-branes”. hep-th/9806199
- [4] I. Ya. Aref'eva and others, “Noncommutative Field Theories and (Super)String Field Theories”. hep-th/0111208
- [5] Sh. Kobayashi, K. Nomizu, “Foundations of differential geometry”, v.1,2, NFMI, 1999 (In Russian).
- [6] A.M.Vinogradov, I.S.Krasilshchik and others, “Symmetries and conservation laws of equations of mathematical physics”, M., Factorial, 1997 (In Russian).
- [7] L. D. Landau, E. M. Lifshits, “Elasticity theory”, Moscow, Nauka, 1987, (In Russian).
- [8] A. D. Sacharov, DAN USSR **177**, 70, (1967) (in Russian).
- [9] A. Tartaglia, *Grav. & Cosmol.* **1**, 335 (1995).
- [10] V. F. Hehl, I. Newman, *In pr.* “Perspectivy edinoj teorii”, MSU, p.137-166, 1991 (In Russian); also F. Gronwald and F. Hehl, gr-qc/9701054.
- [11] V. A. Dmitriev, “Stochastic mechanics”, Moscow, Vysshaya shkola, 1990, (In Russian).
- [12] S. S. Kokarev, *Grav. & Cosmol.* **2**, 96 (1998).
- [13] S. S. Kokarev, *Nuovo Cimento B* **113**, 1339 (1998).
- [14] S. S. Kokarev, *Nuovo Cimento B* **114**, 903 (1999).
- [15] S. S. Kokarev, *Nuovo Cimento B* **116**, 915 (2001).
- [16] F. Warner, “Differentiable manifolds”.
- [17] C. Truesdell, “A first course in rational continuum mechanics”, The Johns Hopkins University, Baltimore, Maryland, 1972.